

4

4105. b.
4

A N

A N S W E R

TO A

P A M P H L E T,

ENTITLED,

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE

PROPRIETY of REQUIRING a

S U B S C R I P T I O N

T O

ARTICLES of FAITH.

By S. Randolph.

O X F O R D.

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS.

Printed for J. and J. FLETCHER, in the Turle; and sold by
Mess. RIVINGTON, in St. Paul's Church-yard, London.

M DCC LXXIV.

J. W. R.

TO A

W. R. H. E.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON

PROPERTY OF RECORDS

SUBSCRIPTION



O. R. D. 48

AT THE CLARKE 4

1012

A N

A N S W E R, &c.

WHEN I took these *Considerations on the Propriety of requiring a Subscription to Articles of Faith* in Hand, I found myself in the Entrance promised great things. I was told that *several able Writers, who had engaged in this Cause, were even yet hardly got in sight of the main Question, and that those original Maxims, which ought to direct all such Enquiries, had long been, and were still, either too little understood, or too much disregarded. And we are promised to have these Maxims revived, and farther explained, and the whole set in a proper Light.* But in the sequel I found myself much disappointed; I could find nothing new advanced, but only old Objections, which have been often answered, revived, with little or no Notice taken of those Answers.

A

The

The Question proposed is *the Propriety of requiring a Subscription to Articles of Faith*. The Affirmative Side of the Question has been maintained by several able Writers. Of these our Author takes no Notice : and very little has he to say in Reply to their Arguments. The Argument indeed seems to lie in a narrow Compass. If it is necessary that those who are to be ordained Teachers in the Church, should be *sound in the Faith*, and that they should give to those who ordain them some Proof, and Assurance, that they are so; and if it is more expedient, more easy to the Person ordaining, more fair with regard to the Candidate for Orders, and more effectual to the Purpose of keeping out of the Church false and erroneous Teachers, that the Method of this Proof should be settled by publick Authority, then a *Subscription to some Articles of Faith* cannot be improper, or inexpedient. But, if this Author can shew that Soundness in the Faith is no necessary Qualification in a *Christian Teacher*; or that a Bishop ought to ordain all who offer themselves, without any Enquiry into their religious Tenets : or, lastly, that this ought to be left to the arbitrary Discretion of the Bishop, and that the
Church

Church has no Concern, nor Authority, to interfere, then we must own the Impropriety of such *Subscription*. But instead of this he seems towards the Close of this Pamphlet to have in a manner given up this main Point*. In answer to a common Plea that all Sorts of pestilent Heresies might be taught in publick, if no such Restraint as this were laid upon the Teachers, he replies---Let those, who are entrusted with the Power of admitting Persons to be Teachers, carefully enquire into their Qualifications, and, according to the best of their Judgment, reject such as they find either grossly ignorant of the general Principles of Religion, or whom they have just reason to suspect of a just determined Resolution to condemn them.---- I should look upon this as a fair Concession: but it is so loosely, and ambiguously, worded, that I know not what to make of it. What does he mean by *the general Principles of Religion*? and what *Religion*, Natural, or Revealed? According to the most obvious Sense of the Words, every one is to be admitted to the Office of a Teacher, but only an *Atheist*, who is ignorant of, or disbelieves the Being, or Providence of God. But I hope our Author means the *Christian Religion*. What then are we to understand by *the gene-*

* p. 25.

ral Principles of this Religion. Perhaps, only ^a a general Profession of their Faith in *Christ*, though they believe not one Doctrine which he taught. Or perhaps he means an Acknowledgement of the Truth of *Scripture*. And this again is a Test that will admit Popish Priests, and all the wildest Sectaries, into our Ministry: for all these pretend to found their Doctrines on *Scripture*. An excellent Method this of guarding against *pestilent Heresies*, by such an Enquiry, as will exclude none of them.

Our Author begins with an Account of *the Rise and Progress of a Custom*, which, as he tells us, *seems to place certain Explications of supposed Scriptures on the same foot with Scriptures themselves, viz. Creeds, and Confessions.* And for what he advances we are to take his Word: for he has given us no Manner of Proof. It will appear that the Reverse of what he has here advanced is true. These *Subtilties of metaphysical Debate* were not introduced by the Governors of the Church, but by the several Hereticks of those Times ^b.

^a See p. 12, 13.

^b This is the Account given us by *Irenaeus*, l. 1. c. 1. s. 20. & c. 2. In him also we may see a particular Account of these Hereticks, and their *Subtilties*. Amongst them we find *Cerinthus*

And *Creeeds*, and *Confessions of Faith*, were from the Beginning found necessary to guard

thus, and others, who denied our *Blessed Saviour's Divinity*. See also *Brigham's Antiquities*, l. x. c. 3 & 4. l. xvi. c. 1. f. 1. *Critical Hist. of the Apostles Creed*, ch. 1.

We are told in a Note that a *Creed* ought to be very clear and intelligible to all Persons: and that the *Terms of Christian Communion* should likewise be as general, and comprehensive, as it is possible. But how we are to make a *Creed*, in which all Parties shall agree: or frame a *Liturgy*, wherein all *Sects of Christians* might join, I cannot easily comprehend: How shall they, who worship *Jesus Christ*, and honour him as *God*, join in the same *Liturgy*, with those who deny his *Divinity*, and esteem his Worship no better than *Idolatry*? The good Man might as well carry his Scheme of *Comprehension* a little farther. Mr *Pope* has given us an *Universal Prayer*. Might not we on the same Plan frame an *Universal Liturgy*, wherein not only all *Sects of Christians*, but all *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Infidels*, as well as *Hereticks*, might join? And yet, I am afraid, even this would not take all in. The whole Body of our *Dissenters* would still be excluded: for they all, I think, declare against pre-conceived *Forms of Prayer*.

In the same Note, though our Author had just before told us that he had no *Design* of entering into the subject matter of our *Articles*, he seems to plead only for some *Relaxation* from the present *Mode of Subscribing*, and complains of our *Articles*, as entailing a whole *System* on us at once. And then he proceeds to calculate how many *Propositions* there are in these *Articles*, I wish he would take the same Pains to calculate how many *Propositions* are contained in the First Chapter of *St. John's Gospel*. There are no less than three in the first Verse. And yet they are all necessary Truths.

against

against their Evasions : nor were any Persons admitted to Baptism without making Profession of the primary Articles of the *Christian* Faith. And, as Heresies multiplied, and new, and *unscriptural* Doctrines were invented, the Church judged it necessary to guard against their Misconstructions of *Scripture*^a. This Writer has put us in mind that even in the *Apostles* Times there were *those who corrupted the Word of God, and handled it deceitfully*. Some such Provision therefore seems to have been necessary to guard against these *deceitful Workers*. So far indeed we are agreed that this Power of the Church may be, and has been, abused. In Process of Time Corruptions stole in, both in Practice, and Faith. And as the *Church of Rome* thought fit to establish these Corruptions, it became necessary to separate from her Communion. But how did the first Reformers do this ? not by abolishing all *Creeds*, and *Confessions*. No, they found it necessary to draw up *Confessions* of their own. As some, who set up for Reformers, had broached many erroneous, and pestilent Doctrines ; the *Lutherans* first, and after their Example other *Protestant Churches*, thought fit to draw up *Confessions* of their *Faith*. And this

^a p. 10.

they

they did, partly, to acquit themselves of the Scandal of abetting wild and seditious *Enthusiasts*, and declaring what were their real Doctrines: partly, to prevent such *Enthusiasts* on the one Hand, and *Popish* Emissaries on the other, from intruding themselves into their Ministry. Nor was there (as far as I can find) ever any Church, ever since the *Apostles* Times, either before, or after, the Reformation, but what had some *Creed*, or *Confession of Faith*. The *Lutherans*, the *Calvinists*, the *Remonstrants*, and even the *Socinians*, as well as our Church, had their Forms of Doctrine, and did not acknowledge such as their Brethren, who would not prefer their Belief of them. Nor is it easy to conceive a Church under any other Notion, but as a Body of Men professing some common Form of Doctrine, and joining in some common form of Worship.

* But we are told that *these good Men were not aware how little agreeable this part of their Conduct might prove to the Principles they first set out upon: which were that the Holy Scripture was our only Standard both of Faith, and Practice; and that its Meaning was to be ascertained to us by our own Reason.* But this

* p. 6.

Inconsistency should not only have been asserted, but proved. They did not set up their *Confessions*, as *Standards of Faith*, nor impose them on Men's Consciences as such. They desired every Man to search the Scriptures, and judge for himself. But though they did not assume a Power over Men's Consciences, nor deny them the Liberty of private Judgment, yet they thought that they had Authority to enjoin a publick Profession of what they judged to be necessary Articles of Faith, as a Condition of external Communion.

But this, it seems, was *one of the chief Causes of the Division, and Distresses*, which we read of in *ecclesiastical Story*.---Our Author, I suppose, thinks that such Divisions, and Disturbances, were not owing to *the perverse disputings of Hereticks, and Schismaticks*, but to the Governors of the Church, who *held fast the Form of sound Words*. And possibly too he may think that Insurrections, and Rebellions in the State, are not owing to the Unruliness of factious Subjects, but to Kings, and Rulers. But most reasonable Men, I believe, will think otherwise. Our Author refers us here for Proof to *Curcellæus*, and *Limborch*. These Men might have but
too

too much Reason to complain of the Impositions of the *Ramish Church*, and those of their own Countrymen at home. But they were both *Remonstrants*, and had given their Assent to, and wrote in Defence of, the *Remonstrants Confession of Faith*. This *Confession* was published with a Preface, wherein are answered the Objections usually urged against such *Confessions*. They are the same with those brought here by our Author,---*that they detract from the Authority of Scripture*---*that they offend Men's Consciences, and hinder the Liberty of Prophecyng*,---*that they occasion Divisions, and Factions*,---I refer him to this Preface for an Answer to every thing he has here alledged^a.

After all, what is all this to the Purpose? The Question proposed is *the Propriety of requiring of Persons to be ordained a Subscription to Articles of Religion*. But he has hitherto been arguing against *Creeds*, and *Confessions of Faith*, required of all Men as *Terms of Communion*. We are hardly yet got in sight of the main Question. If we shorten our *Creeds*, new frame our *Liturgies*, and make our

^a I beg leave also to refer him to Dr *Rogers's* Discourse of the Visible and Invisible Church of *Christ*, p. ii. ch. 6. and to his Review, p. ii. ch. 5.

of Communion so general, and comprehensive, as to take in all Sects of Christians, yet still it may be necessary to take Care that this mixed Multitude may be well taught, and for that Purpose provided with proper Teachers^a, who may be able by sound Doctrine, both to exhort, and to convince the Gainsayers.

But now we seem to be coming to the main Point^b. We are told that *all Kinds of Engagements declarative of our full and final Persuasion in Matters of Faith---are wholly founded on Principles directly opposite to those abovementioned, (I suppose) that Scripture is the Standard of Faith, and that its Meaning is to be ascertained to us by our own Reason---* But we do not set up our *Articles* as a *Rule of Faith*. Nay these very *Articles* declare that ^c *nothing is to be required of any Man to be believed as an Article of Faith, that is not read in Scripture, or may be proved thereby: and that* ^d *besides the same the Church ought not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation.* Nor do we deprive any one of his Right of private Judgment. The Candidate for Orders might judge for himself, before he offered himself, and so he may after Ordination. It is a very unfair

^a Tit. i. 9.^b P. 8.^c Art. vi.^d Art. xx.

State of the Case to call our Subscription a *Declaration of our full, and final, Persuasion, in Matters of Faith.* No Man is hereby tied up from impartially examining the *Word of God*, nor from altering his Opinion, if he finds Reason so to do. ^a We are told indeed (how truly I know not) that the *Church of Scotland* requires her Ministers to *promise to adhere to the same Persuasion to thier Life's End.* I am sure our Church requires no such thing. But I cannot see what Obligation lies on a *Teacher*, who on his Examination alters his Opinion, openly to maintain his new Opinion. Will this Writer say that every *Teacher of the Gospel* is bound to maintain all Truths, and combat all Errors, in all Cases, and *at all Seasons*? If he does, he must allow the Governours of the Church the same Right of Judgment, and the same Zeal for Truth. And if so, they may think themselves obliged to forbid, and restrain, such Person from venting his novel Opinions, as their Minister.

But we are told that *the Judgment of most thinking Men will be always in a progressive State.*---So indeed we find. These *thinking Men* will one Year preach up the *Divinity of*

^a p. 14.

our *Blessed Saviour* ; the next Year they will explain it away ; soon after, growing still wiser, they will teach their Flock that he is a mere Man, and no Worship due to him : at last, they will give them to understand, that the *Apostles Creed* is erroneous. I fear that while the *Teachers Understanding* is in a *progressive State*, his Congregation will be in a retrograde State, with regard both to Faith, and Morals. And I humbly think that in such Cases these *thinking Men*, if they choose to retain their Preferments, should keep their Opinions to themselves^a.

^b What follows is mere Declamation. Our Church *preaches no other Gospel than that which she received, nor propounds any other Articles for Gospel, nor fixes any Standards or Criteria of Faith separate from this Gospel* : and so she has fully declared. She claims indeed *Authority in Controversies of Faith* : but only so far as to judge for herself what shall be her own Terms of Communion, and what Qualifications she shall require in her own Ministers. Nor does our Church herein claim any other

^a See this Point stated by Dr *Randolph* in his *Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity*, App. p. 13.---and more fully handled in Dr *Rogers's* *Civil Establishment of Religion*, Chap. ii. Sect. 7, 8, 9.

^b p. 9, 10.

Authority (as has already been shewn) than what all *Christian Churches*, ancient and modern, *Protestant* as well as *Popish*, have always claimed, and exercised. Nor is this Claim any way inconsistent with the Right of private Judgment, or Liberty of free Enquiry. But we are told that ^a *this Spirit of imposing, stiled the Mystery of Iniquity, began to work as early, as the Apostles Times.* But who were these *Imposers*? Not the Governors of the Church ^b: but *vain Talkers, and Deceivers*, who set themselves up in Opposition those Governors. These were the Persons the *Apostle forewarns us against, as* ^c *corrupting the Word of God, and handling it deceitfully.* If any such should arise amongst us, I should think, and so did *St Paul*, ^d that it concerns the Governours of the Chnrch to *stop their Mouths.*

But we now seem to be coming to the main *Question*^e. We are told that with regard to the Right of requiring Subscription deduced from the Nature of a Society, as such, which Writers on that side generally set out with, it rests entirely on this Argument, or Assertion, viz. that

^a P. 10. ^b Tit. 1. 10. ^c 2 Cor. ii. 17. ^d iv. 2.

^e P. 12.

the Church, like other Societies, has a Power to prescribe its own Terms of Admittance, &c.---To this it is answered that this Society is something more than a mere human Establishment---and that the Terms of Admittance into this Society are fixed by the very Authority that constituted the Society itself. And here three or four Texts of Scripture are brought to prove that we are bound to receive all Persons into this Society on a general Profession of their Faith in Christ. But here again the Question is changed upon us. The thing to be proved was the Impropriety of requiring Subscription of Persons to be ordained. And to prove this he tells us that the Apostles admitted Persons to Baptism on a general Profession of their Faith in Christ. Queen Candace's Eunuch and Cornelius the Centurion were indeed baptized: but they were not ordained Priests, or Deacons. Nor do his Instances prove even the Non-necessity of Baptismal Professions^a. Philip, before he baptized the Eunuch, had preached unto him Jesus, and taught him from Is. liii. the Doctrine of Redemption by Christ: and the Eunuch by his Profession of Faith in Jesus Christ, must be understood to give his Assent to the Doctrines preached to him. Cornelius's

^a Acts ix. 33, &c.

Case was an extraordinary one^a. While St Peter was preaching to him, *the Holy Ghost fell upon all them which heard the Word*. Whereupon Peter answered---*Can any Man forbid Water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we. And he commanded him to be baptized in the Name of the Lord*.---This can be no Rule what is to be done in ordinary Cases. His last Text of Scripture is still less to his Purpose^b. There arose a *Dissension, and Disputation*, among the *Christians at Antioch*, about the Necessity of the *Mosaical Law*. This *Question* was determined in a Council of the *Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem*, who gave Sentence that *no greater Burden should be laid upon the Gentile Converts* than some few necessary Points of Practice. And what is this to the Case of *Creeds, or Subscriptions*. This Passage should rather seem to prove the *Authority of the Church*, both to prevent the teaching of false Doctrines, and to ordain Rites, and Ceremonies.

I know that it has been asserted by some Writers of Note, that the only necessary *Article of Faith* is that *Jesus is the Messiah*: and these Texts, which our Author has pro-

^a Acts x. 44, &c.

^b Acts xv.

duced, and some others, have been brought in proof of it. But I should be glad to know what they mean by this Term---*Messiah*.--- If they mean only a Prophet sent by God, then this Assertion amounts to this, that it is necessary to believe *Jesus* to be a true Prophet, and yet not necessary to believe any one Doctrine which he taught. But if by--*the Messiah*--they mean, as they should mean, *the Only-begotten Son of God, anointed, and sent by the Father, to make Propitiation for the Sins of the World*, this will include all the Fundamental Articles of the *Christian Faith*. Nor can any Argument be drawn from the Practice of the *Apostles*. At the first Publication of the Gospel God bore Witness to it with Signs and Wonders. Those who were convinced by these Miracles, and believed the divine Mission of the *Apostles*, and thereupon submitted to be taught by them, might perhaps be baptized, and received into the Church, without any farther Profession. But this would be no Rule to succeeding Ages. And even in the *Apostles* Days we find that Teaching generally preceded Baptism^a. So it was in the Case of *Queen Candace's Eunuch*. It has been already shewn that *Creeeds* and *Confessions of Faith*

^a See also Acts viii. 12. x. 34. xvi. 14. 32, 33. xviii. 8.

were in Use in the first Ages of the *Christian* Church, and were required of Persons to be baptized^y. This Practice is said by the most ancient Writers to be derived from the *Apostles* themselves. *The Apostles' Creed*, which we now have, though the whole of it was not composed by the *Apostles* themselves, yet was formed upon their Plan; and the greatest Part of it either composed, or authorized, by the *Apostles*, as may be seen in the Writers cited underneath^z. In the Primitive Church no adult Persons were baptized without previous Instruction. * They continued some Time in the State of *Catechumens*, when they were instructed in the Doctrines of *Christianity*, and taught their *Creed*; and when they were admitted to Baptism, they made publick and solemn Profession of their *Faith*, in the Words of

^y *Iren.* L. i. c. 2. *Tertull.* de Præscript. adv. Hæret. c. 13, 21. *Adv. Prax.* c. 2. See also *Bingham's Antiq.* L. x. ch. 3. *Critical Hist. of the Apostle's Creed*, ch. 1. *Rogers' Review*, Part. ii. c. 5. Our Author, perhaps, may cry out, *So early did this Mystery of Iniquity begin to work.* No; it was not *the Mystery of Iniquity*, but *the Mystery of Godliness*, which these *Creeds* set forth—*God manifest in the Flesh.*

^z *Bingham's Antiq.* B. x.

^a *Ib.* B. xi. ch. 7. f. 8, &c.

the *Creed* appointed by the Church ^b. And when Children baptized, they had Sponsors who answered for them.

The like Care was from the Beginning taken to keep false Teachers out of the Church. ^c St. Paul directs *Timothy* to commit those Things which he had heard to faithful Men, who should be able to teach others also: ^d and to ordain such Deacons only as held the Mystery of the Faith in a pure Conscience. ^e And he commissions *Titus* to ordain such Elders in every City as held fast the faithful Word, as they had been taught, that they might be able, by sound Doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the Gainsayers. And he commands him to stop the Mouths of vain Talkers and Deceivers; and to reject, after the first and second Admonition, a Man that is an Heretick. ^f And in the Primitive Church the greatest Care was taken to preserve the Unity of the Faith. Strict Enquiry was made into the Faith and Orthodoxy of all Persons to be ordained: and they were required to give in a Form of

^b Ch. 8. f. 4. ^c 2 Tim. ii. 2. ^d 1 Tim. iii. 9.

^e Tit. i. 5, &c. ^f iii. 10.

^g See *Bingham's Antiq. B.* xvi. ch. 1. Ib. B. iv. ch. 3. f. 2.

Confession of their *Faith* subscribed with own Hand; and those who taught any heretical Opinions were censured, and cast out out of the Church.

I am glad, however, that our Author allows the Church to be a *Society*. As to the *Terms of Admittance*, I refer him to the original Charter ^h, which commissions the *Apostles to receive Disciples into the Church, by baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. I think it may be from hence reasonably concluded, that Persons baptized should make Profession of their *Faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*; and that Persons appointed to be Teachers should be *sound* in this *Faith*, and able to instruct others in the Nature and Offices of these Three Divine Persons.

But here we lose Sight of the Question again; ⁱ and a new one is introduced in its stead, with regard to the Civil Sanctions of Religion. It seems Men must not only not be *compelled*, but must not be *tempted to de-*

^h Matt. xxvii. 19—*μὴ δὲ τιθεσθε βάπτισμα*.

ⁱ Page 13, &c.

clare their Assent to what they cannot believe. The Magistrate therefore must not establish what he thinks the true Religion; must annex no Rewards to it's Professors. There must be no Tythes, no rich Benefices, no Dignities or Bishopricks; for these are *tempting* Things, and may *hazard the Probity* of his Subjects. Or, if he allots any Maintenance to the Teachers of Religion, he must admit all Persons indiscriminately, *Papists*, and all the wildest Sectaries, who hold Principles subversive of the Foundation of what he thinks the true Religion^k. Whether this will contribute to secure either the Peace, or the Probity, of the People, let any reasonable Men judge. I must desire to be excused from following our Author any farther out of the Way. The Authority of the Magistrate in Matters of Religion, the Reasonableness of Toleration, and under what Restrictions it may or may not be granted, are Points of some Difficulty, and cannot be properly treated of in a narrow Compass. And as they are foreign to the present Question, so I have neither Inclination, nor Leisure, to enter into the Discussion of them; and therefore I refer to the ex-

^k See Dr. Balguy's Charge.

cellent Dr. *Rogers*, who has fully handled these Subjects.

But I cannot forbear asking our Author what he means by ¹ *Pains and Penalties*, and *wholesome Severities*? and what, and who he complains of? Does our Church or our Government ^m (to use the Words of the worthy Dean of *Glocester*) inflict any corporal Punishment, or levy any Fines and Penalties, on those who will not comply with the Terms of her Communion? No. Doth it deny them the Right of Privilege of worshipping *God* in their own Way? No: a Toleration is granted them on reasonable Terms. Are Men denied the Liberty of free Debate? No; nothing is punishable by our Laws but open Blasphemy and Profaneness, and publicly impugning the most fundamental Articles of our Religion; and even these Laws are scarce ever put in Execution. Men speak, and write, just what they please, with Impunity. What then do they complain of? Why, that they have node of those Emoluments allotted to the Teachers of the established Religion, which

^m Apology for the *Church of England*, p. 52.

! Page 16.

they

they wish to enjoy without complying with the Terms required; and load the Church, and Government, with Abuse for not gratifying them in their extravagant Demands.

I meet with nothing to the Purpose till p. 21. where we are told, that *such doctrinal Formularies exclude none but conscientious Men from any particular Communion: they create no Difficulty to others, who subscribe them as Things of Course; and in the like Circumstances will subscribe any thing.*---I would desire our Author, instead of *doctrinal Formalities*, to read *Oaths*, and then see how his Argument would run. The Government must require no *Oaths of Allegiance, or Supremacy*, of Persons to be admitted to Posts of Honour or Profit; for these will *exclude none but conscientious Men: others will take them as things of course*, and will swear to any thing. But who are these *others*, who *subscribe the Articles as Things of Course*? He would not, I hope, suggest that the Bulk of the *Clergy* do so. I am well persuaded that the Generality of the *Clergy*, when they offer themselves for Ordination, consider seriously what Office they take upon them, and firmly believe what they *subscribe* to. If by this means some *conscientious Persons*

sons are excluded, we are sorry for it: but we esteem those only fit to be admitted into the *Ministry*, who *hold the Faith*, as well as a good *Conscience*. If unworthy Men, who know not, or care not, what they *subscribe*, by this Means get into the *Ministry*, they would not be excluded, if we were to abolish all *Subscription*. If others *subscribe* against the Dictates of their *Conscience*, and afterwards think themselves at Liberty to *bear their Testimony* against what they have thus solemnly declared their Assent to, it is their Fault alone. If the best Method which could be thought of to *avoid Diversities of Opinions*, and *establish Consent touching true Religion*, may, through the Perverseness and Corruption of Mankind, have had a contrary Effect; surely not the Church, but such Men alone are to blame.

^a But our Church, it is said, at first proceeded on the most extensive Plan.---And pray when has she altered it? We have the same *Articles of Subscription* now as we had in Queen Elizabeth's Time. The royal *Declaration* afterwards prefixed to it, added nothing to them, but only approved and con-

firmed what had been always the true Intent of *subscribing*. I am no way concerned to vindicate every Expression in this *Declaration*. It may be sufficient to observe, that there are some Errors expressly condemned in our *Articles*. and some Doctrines clearly and positively asserted. In these it was the Intention of the Compilers to *establish Consent*; nor were these to be *drawn aside to any new Sense* by forced Constructions. In other more *curious Points* they purposely worded the *Articles* in general Terms, allowing Persons agreeing in the general Sense to differ in the particular Explanation of it.

° Our Author comes now at last to answer the *Pleas offered in Support of this Practice of Subscription*. One of these, he says, is *drawn from the sacred Writings being capable of such a Variety of Senses, that Men of widely different Persuasions shelter themselves under the same Forms of Expression*. It would surely have been more fair to have given us the Words of some of these Advocates for *Subscription*. Let us then take their Plea in their own Terms.---^p *We acknowledge* (says one of them) *the Scriptures to be sufficiently*

° Page 24.

^p A. D. of O's Charge, p. 13.

clear in all Matters necessary to Salvation: but what if Men wrest these Scriptures? explain away the plainest Texts of Scripture, and pretend to prove the most erroneous and pernicious Doctrines from Scripture? Are such Men to be entrusted with the Ministry of the Gospel, and commissioned to teach these erroneous Doctrines? What then is to be done in this Case? I know of no better Way of Security against such Deceivers, than by drawing up Articles explaining such Scriptures as these Men have perverted, and guarding against their Misconstructions. If this is not allowed, we can have no Fence to prevent Popish Emissaries, or any false Teachers whatsoever, from thrusting themselves into the Ministry.

And what has our Author to say in Answer to this? First, he queries whether the Scriptures are in Reality so differently interpreted in Points of real Consequence. But the same Writer has shewn that they are, and instanced in the first Chapter of St. John's Gospel. But we must not take this for granted, and make ourselves sole Judges of this Consequence. So far only does the Church make herself Judge, as to judge what Doctrines are fit to be taught, and what Securities are to be required of those whom she admits into

D

her

her Ministry. And in this the Governors of the Church have the same Right to judge as all other Persons have to judge for themselves, and to act accordingly. But *their Expositions*, we are told, *will at length become equally difficult to be expounded*. If they should, the Church has Power to alter and explain them when she judges it necessary or expedient.

^p *Another Plea* our Author mentions of the same Kind is, that all Sorts of pestilent Heresies might be taught in publick, if no such Restraint as this were laid upon the Teachers.

^q His Reply to this has been already considered. It is indeed a fair Concession that pestilent Heresies ought to be guarded against, and that to this End some Enquiry ought to be made into the Principles of those who are to be appointed Teachers. What then would he give us in the Room of Subscription? --- The Church may, if she thinks fit, supply her Clergy with proper Comments on Scripture, or Homilies properly adapted to their own Times, and, if you please, with Articles of Religion also. --- Very well. But of what Authority are these Comments, Homilies and

^p Page 25.

^q See above, p. 3.

Articles to be? Here we are rather in the Dark. It should seem by what follows, that they are only *for the Edification of these her Sons, as meet Helps and Directions for the more effectual Discharge of their Ministry.* How then will you hinder *pestilent Heresies being taught in publick*, if you admit Persons into your Ministry, who neither approve of your *Comments*, nor believe your *Articles*, and suffer them afterwards to write and preach against all or any of them? But it seems, *Preachers* are to be made *liable to Censure for Impieties, when uttered by them, but not bound beforehand to such a Clog of Precautions.* But here again he shelters himself under general Words. What does he mean by *Impieties*? And who is to be judge what are *Impieties*, and what *Censure* is to be passed upon them. You put *Comments on Scripture*, and *Articles of Religion*, into your *Teachers Hands*. Is he obliged to explain the *Scriptures* in Conformity to these *Comments*? and to teach such *Doctrines* as are set forth in these *Articles*, and no other? If he is, how should we be in a better Case than we are at present? It should seem rather worse; for we should be tied down by *Comments* as well as *Articles*. Supposing then that any of these *Preachers* should preach different

D 2 Doctrines,

Doctrines, and that in the most important and fundamental Points; would you allow the Governors of the Church any Power to restrain them, or suspend them from their Office? Or must they wait till they proceed to open *Blasphemy*, and may be convicted before a Judge and Jury? If so, then all Sorts of *pestilent Heresies* may and will be taught in publick, without any Restraint. And I am humbly of Opinion, that it is much better to take proper *Precaution beforehand*, and more eligible, not to admit those into the Ministry who hold these pernicious Doctrines, than to to censure them for it afterwards---But *Mosheim* represents the Method here recommended to be the Case precisely with the *Arminian Confession*. But these *Arminians* are no national Church: they are, as the same *Mosheim* tells us, a *Medley of Persons of different Principles, who, properly speaking, have no fixed stable Form or System of Doctrine*. And yet these will not look on the *Papists* or the *Calvinists*, who deny their *five Articles* as Brethren. They also thought it necessary to draw up a *Confession of their Faith*, much larger than our Body of *Articles*. And * (as I observed before)

in their *Preface* to this *Confession*, they answer the same Objections against such *Confessions of Faith* as are here revived by our Author.

I must beg Leave to pass by the following long-minded Periods of Declamation: I can find nothing in them but what has been already obviated; and I am tired with repeating the same Answers to the same Objections, cloathed in different Expressions.

I pass on to page 30, where our Author, in Answer to those who have urged that *unscriptural* Words might as well be used in *Confessions of Faith* as in *Preaching*, says, that *the two Cases are widely different*. I can see but little Difference in this Respect. They are both Explications of *Scripture*; and therefore in both other Words must be used besides *Scripture*. Nor does our Church claim any *divine Authority*; nor does she *peremptorily decide Matters for us, or bind them upon us*, as our Author misrepresents the Case. But whereas false Teachers had explained away the Sense of *Scripture* by new and *unscriptural* Distinctions, it was judged necessary to guard against their Evasions, and
thereby

thereby exclude such false Teachers from our Ministry. If we were on this Account forced to make Use of new Terms, the Novelty is chargeable, not on us, but on them. Nor is this (as I have often already observed) any way inconsistent with the Assertion, that *the Holy Scriptures contain all Doctrines required of Necessity for eternal Salvation* †.

However, I cannot pass by one of his long-winded laboured Sentences, though I cannot easily fix his Meaning.----- * *Were some Persons sensible of this* (though I cannot make out from the Context what *this* is) *they would not surely be so forward to suspect us of Hypocrisy and Prevarication, while we esteem ourselves bound to keep up all these Forms, till relieved by proper Authority; nor impute it wholly to our private Interest, when we ministerially comply with what we are not able to*

† But we find the Tables now turned upon us. The Church is now charged with introducing *unscriptural Terms and metaphysical Debates*; whereas it was her Design to guard against the metaphysical Subtleties of vain Deceivers. And it may be, and often has been shewn, that those Things, which may now seem abstruse in our *Creeeds and Articles*, were occasioned by the subtle Evasions of the *Hereticks* of those Days.

* Page 32.

remove;

remove; and patiently remain in Posts, however invidiously represented, where it is conceived that we may do more good, and perform a more acceptable Service to our common Master, by continuing to labour on in his waste Vineyard, and wait his own good Time for Opportunities of using our little Influence [hereby prevented from growing still less] towards pruning a few wild Branches in it, and rooting out some of the rankest Weeds.--Be pleased, Sir, to come out of the Clouds. You have not yet thought fit to tell us who you are, nor what your Tenets are, nor what it is which you so much dislike in our *Forms*. I could wish in particular that you had been more explicit with regard to the Doctrine of the *Trinity*. This Doctrine has been lately abused in very rude and gross Terms. Permit me then to ask, Whether a Person, who disbelieves this Doctrine, can, without *Hypocrisy* and *Prevarication*, subscribe to the *Article*, which asserts, that *in the Unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one Substance, Power, and Eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*. But perhaps there may be some, who at first subscribed to these *Articles as things of course*; but are improved in Knowledge since. But have they never repeated their *Subscription*? and do they think

think themselves at liberty to take upon them the Office of Teachers and Governors, in a Church whose fundamental Doctrines they disbelieve, and repeatedly declare their Assent to what they think false? Again, can Persons of these Principles *esteem themselves bound*, or even at Liberty, to keep up the Forms in our Creeds, and Liturgy? Can they, without *Prevarication*, repeat the Words of a Creed in a publick Congregation, if they do not believe the Contents of it? Can he who denies the *Divinity of our Blessed Saviour*, solemnly protest before God, and his Church, that *he believes in our Lord Jesus Christ---very God of very God--being of one Substance with the Father*? Can he, who disbelieves the Doctrine of a *Trinity*, declare it publicly to be his *Belief*, that *the whole three Persons are co-eternal together, and co-equal*? Nor can such a Man join in the Use of our Prayers. Can he, without *Prevarication*, invoke *the holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, as three Persons, and one God*? Can he address himself to *our Lord Jesus Christ, as one who liveth, and reigneth, with the Father, and the Holy Spirit, ever one God,*

* *Litany.*

* *Collect for 3d Sunday in Advent.*

World

World without End? * Can he pray to God to keep him stedfast in the true Faith, to acknowledge the Glory of the eternal Trinity? Whether these are our Author's Principles I know not: that he differs from the established Church in some important Points, may, I think, fairly be gathered from his own Words. He speaks in the first Person, --*We*--- and he represents our Church as a waste Vineyard; and waits for an Opportunity of pruning the wild Branches in it, and rooting out some of it's rankest Weeds. But my Charge is not personal against him; but in general against all who thus *prevaricate*, who, I fear, are too many, and whose Cause our Author here pleads. And I must ask him what he means by that equivocating Expression of *ministerially complying*?---Does he think that the *Minister* officiating in a publick Congregation speaks only like a Puppet, or like an Actor in a Play, who speaks not in his own Person, but that of another? Or does he esteem *Creeds* and *Publick Prayers* to be only Matters of *Form*, * spoken not from the

* Collect for Trinity Sunday.

* I fear that *Confession* will not be made with the Mouth unto Salvation, unless with the Heart Man believeth unto Righteousness. Rom. x. 10.

Heart, but only from the Mouth? Can he solemnly profess in his own Person, saying--*I believe--* before *God*, in his Church, and at his Altar, in the Face of the Congregation assembled for Divine Service, and yet *believe* nothing of what he professes his *Belief* of? Is he the Mouth of the Congregation? but surely he is one of the Congregation, and must be supposed to declare his own Faith, as well as that of others. If he does not declare his own Faith, pray who does? Again, if he solemnly addresses himself to *God* in Terms containing what he verily thinks to be a Falshood; if he prays to him as *God*, whom he believes to be no *God*, is there not a Lie in his Mouth? Does he not hereby deceive his Congregation, and mock *God*? But it seems that *we comply*, and *patiently remain in Posts* (yes, and *patiently* enjoy the Profits of those *Posts*, and *patiently* rise from one *Post* to another) *that we may do more good, and perform a more acceptable*

Such Dissimulation was held in Abhorrence by the *Heathens* themselves. When *Euripides's* Tragedy was acted on the Theatre at *Athens*, where *Hippolytus* says,--*Ἡ γλῶσσις ὀμώμετος ἢ δὲ φρενὶ ἀνέμετος*--*My Tongue has sworn, but not my Heart*--*Socrates* was so offended at this Prevarication, though only spoke by an Actor, out of a Play, that he left the Theatre.

Service

Service to our Master---that is, in *Scripture Language*--- ' *Let us do Evil, that Good may come.*--- What would this Writer himself think of a *Jesuit*, who should talk, and act thus? who should apply for *Orders*, take the *Oath of Supremacy*, subscribe our *Articles*, and declare his Assent to our *Common Prayer*; should take upon him the Office of a *Priest* in our Church, accept of *Benefices*, *Dignities*, and a *Bishoprick* and on every new Promotion repeat his *Subscriptions* and *Declarations*? Should such a Man officiate in our Church, and declare that he did this in order to *do more good, and perform a more acceptable Service to his Master*; that he continued to labour on in the waste *Vineyard*, and waited a good Time, and a proper Opportunity of pruning the wild Branches, and rooting out the rankest Weeds in the *Vineyard*; that is, in more plain English, of subverting our Establishment, and bringing us back to *Popery*. Would not our Author call this gross *Hypocrisy* and *Prevarication*? Justly he might without any invidious *Misrepresentation*. And yet this Man would have more to say for himself than those, whose Cause he pleads. He might say that it was his Principle that no

† Rom. iii. 8.

Faith was to be kept with *Hereticks*, and that he had a Dispensation from the *Pope*, which quieted his Conscience. Nay, farther, a *Popish Priest* might more innocently officiate in our Churches, and join in our *Creeds*, and *Liturgy*, than a *Socinian* can.

* But our Author pleads the Example of *our first Reformers*: and so might our supposed *Jesuit* do with a better Grace. They, we are told, *did not quit their Stations in the Church*, but *used all their Endeavours to amend it*.---I am no way concerned to vindicate every Thing which these great and good Men did. It pleased *God* to bring about the *Reformation* by human Means. The *first Reformers* were Men, and subject to human Frailties. If they were guilty of any undue Compliances in *King Henry the Eighth's* Time, they had great Temptations to them. The *King* had begun a *Reformation* by denying the *Pope's Supremacy*. But he was a Prince of a high Spirit; and a zealous Assertor of all the other Errors of *Popery*. The Truth indeed is, these Reformers themselves were not weaned from

* Page 32.

these Errors but by Degrees. ^a Both *Cranmer*, and *Ridley*, held the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* till the latter End of King *Henry's* Time. And therefore they might without *Hypocrisy* officiate in the *Mafs*. But they were not such *ministerial* *Compliers*, as is here represented. ^b When *Cranmer* was consecrated Archbishop of *Canterbury*, he scrupled taking the Oath to the *Pope*: and at last, by the Advice of some *Cano-nists*, before he took the Oath he made a publick Protestation, that he did not intend thereby to restrain himself from any thing that he was bound to, either by his Duty to *God*, or the *King*, or the *Country*: by which, says *Dr. Burnet*, if he did not wholly save his Integrity, yet it was plain he intended no Cheat, but to act fairly, and above-board. ^c When the six *Popish Articles* were established 1539, *Shaxton* Bishop of *Salisbury*, and *Latimer* Bishop of *Worcester*, resigned their Bishopricks, though the former indeed afterwards recanted, and was a Persecutor

^a *Strype's Memorials of Cranmer*, B. i. ch. 18. *Dr. Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley*, B. iii. f. 5.

^b *Strype's Memorials*, B. i. ch. 4. *Burnet's History of the Reformation*, B. ii. p. 129.

^c *Ib.* B. iii. p. 266. *Strype's Memorials*, B. i. c. 19. *Dr. Neve's Animadversions on Philips*, p. 511.

of the *Protestants* in *Queen Mary's* Time. *Cranmer* was protected by the King; and not only did not subscribe, but openly declared, and wrote against them. In *Queen Mary's* Reign it is well known what a glorious Stand these great Men made; and how far from any *Compliance* all of them were, excepting only one, who fell, and rose again to receive the Crown of Martyrdom. We may therefore, upon the whole, *admire their Spirit, and applaud their Conduct.* Be it our Care to avoid their Failings, and copy after their good Examples.

Lindsey One of our Author's Associates seems to be convinced of the Iniquity of such *ministerial Compliance*. He has resigned his Preferment, and published an *Apology* for so doing. I really think he needed no *Apology*. I think he has acted an honest Part in giving up his Benefice, rather than officiate in a Service, which he could not join in without gross Hypocrisy. If he believed no Worship to be due to our *Saviour*, he was right not to offer up a Form of Prayer, wherein he is so often invoked, and addressed to, as *God*. But for the same Reason he cannot join in our Communion, nor attend our publick Worship. Nor can he
join

join himself to any Church in *Christendom*. *Jesus Christ* is worshipped in every *Christian* Church, and has been so in all Ages from the very first Propagation of *Christianity* to this Day. We cannot call this Gentleman either *Arian*, or *Socinian*: he outstrips both. Both *Arius*, and *Socinus*, held Worship to be due to *Christ*. ^d Nay, when *Franciscus Davides*, following only the necessary Consequences of *Socinus's* own Doctrine, denied the Worship of *Christ*, *Socinus* was greatly provoked, wrote against him with great Bitterness, and called him a *Blasphemer*, more than an *Heretick*, and unworthy the Name of a *Christian*. And this *Davides* was persecuted by the *Socinians*, and cast into Prison, where he died a miserable Death. And accordingly in the *Racovian* Catechism we find the Worship of *Christ* defended on the same Principles, as the *Romanists* defend the Worship of *Saints*, and *Angels*. ^e And to the Question---*What think you of those who hold that Christ is not to be worshipped?* The An-

^d *Socinus contra Vujek*, c. 2. *Mosheim Hist. Eccles.* Vol. ii. p. 280.

^e *Quid vero sentis de iis hominibus, qui Christum non invocant, nec adorandum censent? Prorsus non esse Christianos sentio, cum re ipsa Christum non habeant, et licet verbis id negare non audeant, re ipsa negent tamen.*

swer is---*I think they are by no means Christians.*

Mr. Evans

Another of this Fraternity, not quite so honest, is now under Prosecution (I suppose it will be called *Persecution*) for publicly speaking, and preaching, against the Doctrines of our Church, calling her *Articles* profane, and her Worship idolatrous, and even *the Apostle's Creed* erroneous; altering the *Liturgy*, and leaving out such Parts of the Service, as he does not like. And yet this Man keeps his Benefice, to which he was lately instituted, when he subscribed our *Articles*, and declared them all to be agreeable to the Word of God, and solemnly in the Church promised to conform to our *Liturgy*, which he now in that very Church abuses in the grossest Terms. However extraordinary this may seem, I esteem him one Degree honestest than our ministerial Compilers: *he acts fairly, and above board.*

And these are the Men, who petition for *Relief in Matters of Subscription*. What would they have? and what will content them? Most of them have been backward to speak out. Our Author deals mostly in general Terms. But they have now, some of them at least, plainly spoken out. Nay

we

we are here told that they *patiently remain in their Posts, and wait the Opportunity of pruning our wild Branches, and rooting out out rankest Weeds.* Give them therefore the *Relief* they ask for, and they will overturn our Church, *Root and Branch.* Allow them the *Liberty of Prophecyng*, which they contend for, and all Sorts of Doctrines will be publickly taught in our Pulpits, and the most important Articles of our Religion openly vilified. But neither will this satisfy them. We must part with all our *Creeeds*, even the *Apostles Creed*; we must abolish, or new modify our *Liturgy*, and in short give up our whole Establishment. And what End will be served by these Concessions? Will it promote either Peace, or Edification, if all Men of all Persuasions are allowed, and commissioned, to teach in our Churches whatever Doctrines they please? These Men (it seems) *keep to Forms at present*: but when *relieved by proper Authority*, they will soon fall to Work in our *Vineyard*, and root out all our rank Weeds. I fear, if we let these *Weeders* in, they will tear up the *True Vine* itself. But can these *Weeds* be rooted out, without stirring the Ground? What is it which makes them so earnest to

F

root

root them out? A Zeal for Truth, I suppose. And would not others be as zealous to support what they call Truth? Would there not be many who would esteem, what they call *rank Weeds*, as the fairest Flowers in the Garden? Our Author may perhaps fancy that all but the *conscientious Men* of his own Way of thinking *subscribe the Articles as Things of Course, and will subscribe any thing*. But he will most certainly find himself mistaken. He will find the Bulk of the Clergy as zealous to maintain, and as able to defend, the Doctrines of our Church, as he is to oppose them. And many common *Christians*, I believe, will be greatly scandalized, if you take away their *Creeds*, and *Catechism*, and strike out of the *Liturgy* such Things as they have always esteemed essential. Shall we gain any *Dissenters* by these comprehensive Schemes? I am afraid but few, and we may create more. New Sects of *Dissenters* will arise, who will be as much offended at our leaving out necessary things, as others are for enjoining things indifferent. If you abolish the Worship of our *Blessed Saviour*, I declare that I will be myself a *Dissenter*: nor will I join in Communion with any Church
which

which does not in her publick Worship
** call on the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.--*
Church did I say?---No, it is no Church---
 the very Name implies the Worship of our
 LORD. But farther; would these Reform-
 ers agree among themselves? Those who
 deny the *Divinity* of our *Blessed Saviour*, as
 they would fiercely contend with those who
 hold this Doctrine, so they would differ from
 one another. [†] Some would maintain that
 he was a *Second Jehovah*; others that he
 was a mere Man. Some would tell us that
 they who worshipped not *Christ* were no
Christians; others would call this Worship
idolatrous. This we see was warmly con-
 tested among the *Socinians*; and they abused,
 and persecuted, one another. And in the
 blessed Times of *Oliver Cromwell*, when the
Church of England was subverted, the several
Sectaries divided, and quarrelled among them-
 selves. And how would the People be edi-
 fied by this Freedom of Debate? The Pul-
 pit would be made a Stage of Controversy;
 and while the different Teachers were dis-

^{*} 2 Cor. i. 2.

[†] Bishop of *Glogher's* Essay on Spirit.

puting, and wrangling with one another on the most important Points, while one taught one Doctrine, and one another, and that with equal Authority, the People would not know what to believe; and probably many of them would be of no Religion at all, while others would seek Refuge in *Po-pery*^s.

But why may not Persons of different Persuasions be united by Charity, and mutual Forbearance? And why may they not now under the present Establishment? Why may not Persons of different Communions live in Peace, and Charity, as well as those of different Persuasions under the same Communion? We bear no Malice, or Hatred, to those who differ from us, nor do we desire to persecute, or injure them. If they dislike the Terms of our Communion, we *compell* them not to *come in*: they may join themselves to any Conventicle they like best.

If they approve not the Doctrine of our *Articles*, they need not *subscribe* them. If after

^s See Dr. *Balguy's* Charge, p. 5, &c. Mr. *White's* Appendix to his three Letters.

their *Subscription* they should change their Opinion, yet, if they keep their Opinion to themselves, no Man will, or can, hurt them. Instead of this, the Press teems with the bitterest *Invectives* against our Establishment in general : and the most essential Doctrines of our Church are treated with the greatest Asperity. If these warm Zealots were admitted into our Church, and suffered to teach what they would without Restraint, will they be more quiet than they are now ? I think it has been already shewn that such Comprehension would contribute neither to Charity, nor Peace, nor Edification.

^h But I may be asked, perhaps, --- Are there no Faults in our present Constitution ? Is there nothing that I myself should be glad to see altered ? --- I shall speak my Mind fairly and freely. There are some things in our *Articles*, and *Liturgy*, which I should be glad to see amended (though, I believe, not the same as these Gentlemen would object to) in many other things I

^h See Dean *Tucker's* Apology, p. 54, &c.

should

should be willing (though against my own Opinion) to make all reasonable Concessions, if by that Means we might obviate Objections, gain any considerable Number of Dissenters without making more, quiet weak Consciences, or promote Peace, and Unity, amongst *Protestants*. But when such bitter Invectives are published against our Church, as the *Confessional*, and several others of the same Stamp; when we are loaded with Reproaches; when the most fundamental Doctrines of *Christianity* are attacked, and Principles advanced, which are subversive of all Establishments, I fear there is little Room to hope for Peace, or Accommodation with such Men. And therefore I humbly think, with all due Submission to my Superiors in Church, and

¹ This Writer seems to tread in the same Steps tho' --- *non passibus æquis*.—Witness his Conclusion, where our Church, and it's Government, are compared to the *Jewish Church*, and it's *Rulers*, in our *Saviour's* Time.—He had before compared it to the *Tower of Babel*. Strange it is that he should not see the Folly, the Injustice, the Indecency, of such invidious Comparisons. Sufficient it may be to answer that our Church teaches not for Doctrines the Commandments of Men: and that he has not wrought any Miracles, nor offered us any good Reasons for our Conviction.

State,

State, that we had better wait for more peaceable Times, and be contented with our present Constitution as it is, till a fairer Prospect shall appear of changing it for the better.

ADDENDA.

A D D E N D A.

WHEN I wrote these Papers, I had not seen Mr. *Lindsay's* Apology: I have since obtained a Sight of it. I find he renders the Text 1 *Cor.* i. 2. which I have cited above, p. 43.---*with all them that are called by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ*--and refers us to Dr. *Hammond* for Proof. Dr. *Hammond* is a learned, and able, Commentator: but his Interpretation of this Text is sufficiently confuted by Dr. *Whitby* in his Annotations. One need indeed only turn to the Texts cited by Dr. *Hammond*. The Word---ἐπικαλούμενος---by itself indeed signifies called, or named. The four first Texts of *Scripture* produced by him amount to no more, as *Matt.* x. 3. *Luke* xxii. 3. *Acts* i. 23.---iv, 3.---*Lebbæus, whose Surname*
was

was Thaddæus--Judas surnamed Iscariot, &c. The next Text he cites proves directly against him. *Acts* vii. 58. the Word --- *ἐπικαλούμενον*--there is plainly used, not in the *Passive*, but the *Middle Voice*, and signifies *calling upon*, or *invoking*--and is by the Doctor himself rendered--he continued in Prayer to God. But the same Verb--*ἐπικαλέομαι*--- with an *Accusative Case* following it, always signifies *calling upon in Prayer*, or *appealing to*, as a Witness, or Judge. To call upon the Lord, or upon the Name of the Lord, is a common Phrase used in the *Old Testament* to signify the *Worship of God*: and is expressed in the *Septuagint* by the Verb--*ἐπικαλέομαι*--in the *Middle Voice*. Thus we read *Gen.* xii. 8. that *Abraham built an Altar unto the Lord, and called upon the Name of the Lord*--*ἐπικαλέσατο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Κυρίου*. --- And so again again xiii. 4. and xxi. 33. where 'tis expressed *ἐπικαλέσατο τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου*. --- ^a *Isaac also built an Altar, and called upon the Lord.* ^b The same Phrase of *calling upon*

^a *Gen.* xxvi. 25.

^b *1 Kings* xviii. 24. *1 Chron.* xvi. 8. *Psal.* lxxix. 6. lxxx. 18. xcix. 6. cv. 1. cxvi. 4, 14. *Is.* lxiv. 7. *Jer.* x. 35. *Lam.* iii. 54. *Joel* ii. 32. *Zach.* xiii. 9.

the Name of the Lord is used in many other Places---Επικαλεῖσθαι τὸν Κύριον-- or --τον Θεόν, &c. is also used in many Places in a *Active* Sense for the *Worship of God*. The same Phrase is used in the same Sense in many Places of the *New Testament*, and particularly in those cited by Dr. H. and so he himself acknowledges. So he does in his Paraphrase of *Aets* vii. 59. as we have already seen. In *Aets* ii. 21. St. Peter quotes the Prophecy of *Joel* ii. 3. and applies it to the Times of the *Gospel*--Πᾶς ὁ ἄν. ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται--- *Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved*. In the Prophet it plainly signifies the *Worship of God*: and therefore must signify the same in the Citation. The same Prophecy is also cited by St. Paul, Rom. x. 13. another Text produced by Dr. H. which proves directly against him. For St. Paul applies this particularly to *Christ*. He was before speaking of *Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*, v. 9, &c. and then adds, v. 12. *The same Lord over all, is rich unto all that call upon him*. Then follows this Quotation from *Joel*. And in the next Verse the Apostle adds--*How shall they call on him, in whom they have not believed?*--The Apostle
is

is speaking of *Christ*. To call upon him is therefore something different from, and subsequent to, *believing on him*, and can scarce signify any thing else than *worshipping him*. And Dr. H. renders it---*they shall constantly confess, pray, and adhere to Christ*. The Verb here is certainly used in an *Active* Sense. There is one more Text cited by the Doctor: and that is *Acts* ix. 14. where *Ananias* says to the *Lord*, who appeared to him in a *Vision*.---*Here be, viz. Saul, hath Authority from the Chief Priests to bind all that call on thy Name* --- τὰς ἐπικαλούμενους τὸ ὄνομα σου---which Dr. H. renders-- *all that publickly avow the Worship of Christ*--- and refers to the same Phrase *Acts* xxii. 16. which he renders *joining with the Church in Performance of all Christian Duties of Devotion to God*--It cannot indeed here, nor at V. 21. signifies *those who were called by the Name of Christ*: 'for the Disciples were not called *Christians* till some time after at *Antioch*. And for the same Reason in the last cited Text *Acts* xxii. 16. where *Ananias* bids *Saul arise, and be baptized, and wash*

° *Acts* xi. 26.

away his Sins, calling on the Name of the Lord--*ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου*--must signify in an *Active* Sense, worshipping the Lord. Again, they that call on the Lord out of a pure Heart--is a Phrase used by St. Paul 2 Tim. ii. 22, to signify good Christians, a Phrase nearly synonymous to this 2 Cor. i. 2. The same Verb also--*ἐπικαλεῖσθε*--is used 1 Pet. i. 17. in an *Active* Sense, to signify the *Worship* of God. In some other Places both of the Old, and New Testament, the Name of God is said to be called on Persons, or Things, devoted to his Service : but here the Phrase is different ; the Word--*ὄνομα*--is here a *Nominative Case* prefixed to the Verb. But where the Verb--*ἐπικαλέομαι*--is followed by an *Accusative Case*, it always signifies to *invoke*, or *worship*, excepting only where it signifies to *appeal to*. And if so, we want neither *Precept*, nor *Example*, for the *Worship* of Christ.

F I N I S.

Lately printed by J. and J. FLETCHER, in the
Turle, Oxford;

THE Reasonableness of requiring Subscription to Articles of Religion from Persons to be admitted in Holy Orders; or, a Cure of Souls, vindicated in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, in the Year 1771.

The Certainty of a Future State asserted and vindicated against the Exceptions of the late Lord Bolingbroke.—A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford.

An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Reflections on the Impropriety of Lay-Subscription to the 39 Articles, in the University of Oxford. Addressed to the Author.

The Excellency of the Jewish Law considered. In Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. To which is added, an Appendix: And also a short Comment on Psalm CIX. and LV. wherein they are shewn not be be Imprecatory but Prophetical.

Christ the Lord of Glory.—A Sermon before the University of Oxford, with Additions, confirming and enforcing the Doctrine.

The Use of Reason in Matters of Religion stated and explained.—A Sermon before the University of Oxford.

Jephtha's Vow considered.—A Sermon before the University of Oxford. With an Appendix, &c.

The Witness of the Spirit.—A Sermon before the University of Oxford.

The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, explained in a Sermon before the University of Oxford.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the Exceptions of a late Pamphlet, entitled an Essay on Spirit, in three Parts, with an Appendix.

* The above are all by the Rev. THOMAS RANDOLPH, D.D. President of C.C.C. Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, and Arch-deacon of Oxford.

Printed by J. and J. Farrow, in the
Tower, Oxford.

THE REASONABLENESS of requiring Subscriptions to Articles of Religion from Persons to be admitted in Holy Orders; of a Cure of Souls, vindicated in a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, in the Year 1771.
The Certainty of a Future State, asserted and vindicated against the Extremes of the late Lord Ballymore. — A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, at the late Anniversary of the University, on the 10th of October, 1771.
An Answer to a Pamphlet, entitled, Reflections on the Impropriety of Lay Subscriptions to the Articles, in the University of Oxford. Addressed to the Rector.
The Excellency of the Jewish Law considered. In Two Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, to which is added, an Appendix: And also a Short Comment on Psalm lix. and lxv. wherein they are shewn not to be incompatible with Prophecy.
On the Lord of Glory. — A Sermon before the University of Oxford, with Additions, concerning and enforcing the same.
The Use of Reason in Matters of Religion, traced and explained. — A Sermon before the University of Oxford.
Patriarch's Vow considered. — A Sermon before the University of Oxford. With an Appendix, &c.
The Willing of the Spirit. — A Sermon before the University of Oxford.
The Doctrine of Justification by Faith, explained in a Sermon before the University of Oxford.
A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, from the Extraneous of a late Pamphlet, entitled an Essay on Spirit, in three Parts, with an Appendix.
The above are all by the Rev. Thomas Kennington, D.D. President of C.C.C. Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity, and Arch-deacon of Oxford.